

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 4, 28, 31 and 44 are amended. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 27, 29 – 30, 32 – 43, and 45 – 47 are cancelled. New claims 48 – 69 have been added. Claims 4, 28, 31, 44 and 48 – 69 are pending in this application. Assignee respectfully submits that no new subject matter has been added in these amendments and that new claims 48 – 69 find support in at least Figs. 1-5 and associated portions of the specification. Further, cancellation of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 27, 29 – 30, 32 – 43, and 45 – 47 has been made without prejudice and no subject matter has been surrendered in the process. Additionally, Assignee has amended claims 28 and 44 to more clearly delineate intended subject matter, not to distinguish over cited art.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Final Office Action of December 8, 2006, (hereinafter "The Office Action") the Examiner indicated that claims 28 and 44 are allowable. Assignee thanks Examiner for pointing out such subject matter. However, Assignee submits that Examiner has merely pointed out one example of subject matter that is patentable in the claims presented, and that other subject matter may be patentable. Accordingly, Assignee does not acquiesce to any position that such identified subject matter is the only patentable subject matter and reserves the right to pursue claims to other patentable subject matter in this patent application and any related future patent applications. Additionally, because Assignee has amended claims 28 and 44 only to more clearly delineate intended subject matter, Assignee respectfully submits that claims 28 and 44 remain allowable.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,208,968 to Camsell et al. (hereinafter "Camsell"). Assignee respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation the prior art reference must teach every element or limitation of a claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP § 2131.

### **Claims 4 and 31**

#### **Failure to teach all claim limitations**

Claim 4, as amended, recites, in part:

... a plurality of first contact members of a first length, each of the first contact members including one end connected to the board and the other end to connect to an external device; and at least two second contact members of a second length **wherein the at least two second contact members include one contact member connected to a first voltage line of a VSS voltage level, and another contact member connected to a second voltage line of a VDD voltage level or a VCC voltage level.**  
(emphasis added).

Claim 31, as amended, recites similar limitations.

Camsell appears to disclose a pin header connector (10) including contact pins of three different lengths where a longest pin (16') is connected to ground, a second longest pin (16'') is connected to power, and a shortest pin (16''') is connected to a signal. Hence, Camsell appears to disclose that such a connector, when being coupled to a printed circuit board, permits the ground pin to make contact before the power pin, and the power pin to make contact before the signal pin (See Camsell; Figs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 17-30).

Assignee submits that Camsell fails to teach or disclose "at least two second contact members of a second length wherein the at least two second contact members include one contact member connected to a first voltage line of a VSS voltage level, and another contact member connected to a second voltage line of a VDD voltage level or a VCC voltage level" as recited in claim 4.

Assignee respectfully submits that, for at least the reason set forth above, claims 4 and 31 are not anticipated by Camsell. It is noted that claimed subject matter may be patentably distinguished from the cited art for additional reasons; however, the foregoing is believed to be sufficient. Thus, Assignee believes that claims 4 and 31 are in condition for allowance.

**Other art cited**

The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camsell in view of U.S. Patent 4,985,870 to Faraci (hereinafter "Faraci") and U.S. Patent 6,804,119 to Ziemkowski (hereinafter "Ziemkowski"). Because Assignee has cancelled claims 11 and 39, Assignee submits that the rejection under 103(a) is moot.

Assignee further submits that none of Camsell, Faraci, or Ziemkowski, taken alone or in any combination thereof, teaches or suggests claimed subject matter.

In addition, it is noted that Assignee's failure, if any, to comment directly upon any positions asserted by the Examiner in the Office Action does not indicate agreement or acquiescence with any such asserted positions.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account 50-3703.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500. Timely consideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 2, 2007

/Robert D. Hinchliffe/  
Robert D. Hinchliffe  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 55,268

Berkeley Law & Technology Group, LLP  
1700 NW 167<sup>th</sup> Place, Suite 240  
Beaverton, OR 97006  
(503) 439-6500  
Customer No. 43831